

# The Times-Dispatch

DAILY—WEEKLY—SUNDAY

Business Office: 115 E. Main Street  
 Telephone Bureau: 1153 Hull Street  
 Petersburg Bureau: 109 N. Exchange Street  
 Lynchburg Bureau: 215 E. Eighth Street

BY MAIL. One Six Three One  
 POSTAGE PAID. Year. \$3.00  
 Daily with Sunday. \$1.00  
 Daily without Sunday. \$1.00  
 Sunday edition only. \$1.00  
 Weekly (Wednesday). \$1.00

By Times-Dispatch Carrier Delivery Service in Richmond (and suburbs), Manchester and Petersburg—

One Week  
 Daily with Sunday. 16 cents  
 Daily without Sunday. 15 cents  
 Sunday only. 15 cents

Entered January 7, 1903, at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter under act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 17, 1910.

## TURNED DOWN FOR THE THIRD TIME

Yesterday by a vote of 23 to 12 the New York State Republican Committee rejected the effort of Lloyd C. Griscom to postpone the selection of Temporary Chairman of the State Republican Convention to be held in Saratoga on September 27. The Committee also rejected by a vote of 29 to 15 a resolution to make Colonel Roosevelt Temporary Chairman of the Convention and forthwith elected Vice-President Sherman for the position. The Associated Press reported that Sherman's election was "unanimous." "Lloyd C. Griscom and Henry Mack, of New York, not voting." The Committee transacted no further business and adjourned to meet at Saratoga on September 26, the day before the Convention will assemble.

It was a good day's work, and it was well done, but it was distinctly displeasing to Mr. Griscom, the head of the County Republican organization in New York City. After the Committee had adjourned, he is said to have indicated in very pronounced terms the measure of his disappointment and to have indulged in sundry predictions as to the disastrous effect of the Committee's work on "a great many primary contests, as it is obvious that those voting to deny him (the Colonel) the office of Temporary Chairman will have to account to the enrolled Republicans of their respective districts for their action." The members of the Committee ought to have known better, of course, and, in a way, we are sorry for them and can see them now fairly shriveling under the fiery indignation of the "enrolled Republicans," who will surely make the Committee smoke for daring to obstruct the purposes of the Colonel and his emissary, the ever faithful Griscom, whose very garments smelt of the sacred fire while yet he was conveying to the Committee the greetings of Oyster Bay. Speaking of the action of the Committee, Mr. Griscom said:

"I presented the name of former President Roosevelt after consulting with him. The place of the Temporary Chairman was obviously his, not only by virtue of his having been President of the United States, but by the signal services rendered by him to the Republican party in New York. Mr. Roosevelt was anxious to engage in the political campaign in this State, and his name at the head of the Convention would have lent extraordinary prestige to the meeting and been of incalculable value to the party throughout the State."

One thing emerges from this statement: Griscom attended the meeting of the Committee as the ambassador extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the Colonel, or, as he expressed it, "after consulting with him." The Committee knew this, and yet it turned him down. Griscom, speaking as one with authority, thought that the selection of the Colonel was his by Divine right. The Committee did not agree with him. Griscom thought that the Convention of the party would lend "extraordinary prestige to the meeting." The Committee did not think so. In our opinion, as a rank outsider, the Committee was entirely right in its view of the situation. Of course, Pinchot and Garfield and Glavis and Kerby and Bristow and Cummins and Dooliver, and possibly Cope Johnson, will shudder at the temerity of the Committee in dealing with Griscom, the dove sent out from the Ark at Oyster Bay with the bit in his teeth, as it were.

This is the third time the Grand Old Party in New York State, the Colonel's own State, has turned him down since his return from the shambles in Africa and the regulation of British affairs down in Egypt. First, the Legislature at Albany disregarded his message, sent through this same pernicious Griscom, to pass the primary election bill. Second, the party in the Herkimer District put the double cross on the Colonel's nephew who was running for Congress with his express consent, and now, in the third place, but not by any means, it is hoped, the last place, the Committee rejected his request, for if Griscom has been fairly reported that is what it amounted to, for election as Temporary Chairman of the Republican Convention of his own State. In doing this, the Committee not only subjected itself and all its members, excepting Griscom and Mack, who refrained from voting, to scorn and contumely, which they richly deserve on general principles, but it hurt Griscom's feelings.

There is one point in Griscom's statement which is open to remark: "The place of the Temporary Chairman was obviously his (the Colonel's), not only by virtue of his having been President of the United States, but by," etc. A good many hundreds of thousands of people in this country are of the opinion that by virtue of his having been President of the

United States, the Colonel should abstain from pernicious political activity. General Grant lived for some years after he had been President and nobody ever heard of him holding conferences with all sorts of political tramps day after day and trying to dictate what the country should do with this, that or the other question of present moment, and plotting with one faction of his party, and with all factions of all parties that might have sought his counsel. Arthur was President of the United States; but no one ever heard of his sending some convenient Griscom to the party authorities of New York with a request that he be made the king pin in the party machinery. Cleveland was President of the United States; but he did not attempt the direction of party movements after his retirement from office, and we can very well believe that he would have been heartily ashamed of himself if he could have forgotten the dignity of his office to such an extent as to make it possible for him to get down among the ward-healers. Benjamin Harrison was President of the United States; but he had no Griscoms in his train and would have scorned to abuse his honors even for the sake of exercising the power that had departed from his hands. It was not until it got down to the Colonel that any former President of this great country ever debased his position as this man has done with whip and spur and shout of defiance to all who do not follow wherever he may choose to lead.

Another thing that Griscom is reported to have said is: "There was no question of endorsing or not endorsing the administration. If an effort is made to show that the choice of Vice-President Sherman is an endorsement, whereas the choice of Colonel Roosevelt would not have been it must of necessity fall, as Mr. Roosevelt's views regarding the conduct of public affairs by his successor are well known."

We are sorry that Griscom did not tell what the Colonel's "views regarding the conduct of public affairs by his successor" are. Griscom says that they are "well known." "Well known" to whom? To Pinchot and Garfield and the rest of that bunch of political loafers, perhaps; but not to the generality of mankind. We should like to know what they are, and Mr. Taft would doubtless be glad to find out "where he is at." In our view, the Colonel's interference in the affairs of the present Administration, as reported by the newspapers and various persons who have claimed to have been in close touch with him, is nothing short of a public scandal. The people are getting tired of it, have been for a long time, and are getting "tired" every day; but we hope that the Colonel will keep it up, and that the Triumphal Democracy will keep a close score on his movements and on his sayings. It is as certain as anything can be in politics that he can't come back.

## THE TARIFF AND HIGH LIVING.

Senator Joe Johnston, of Alabama, and his associates of the Senate minority committee on Wages and Prices of Commodities, have made an excellent report on the causes of the cost of high living in this country. According to Cabot Lodge and his majority, there is nothing wrong at all with conditions; but Johnston and his associates know better. They blame it on the tariff and they prove it, the three substantial causes for the advance in the cost of living, as stated by them, being: First, the tariff; second, the trusts, combines and monopolies; and, third, the increased money supply. "The two first are the chief malefactors." The minority might have added that the two first are the same, the tariff being the parent of the trusts and combines and monopolies.

We do not think that the minority report is as dignified, possibly, as a State paper ought to be, but it is all the better for that, as the people will probably see the point of the joke, the people having a very clever sense of humor and being able to tell a hawk from a hand saw at any time, once they have been touched in a human way.

The minority make a very clear distinction between the "higher cost of living" and the "cost of higher living." Under the direction of Senator Lodge the investigations of the committee were largely confined to food stuffs and cotton, their cost of production and distribution, and of which the United States export great quantities; but upon the territory of the highly protected commodities the committee scarcely touched. The minority found out some things, however, that are worth knowing and worth remembering. Under the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, which is described by Mr. Taft as the "best tariff bill ever passed by a Republican Congress," and which he did not approve at the time of its passage because it did not carry out the pledges of his party, "champagne was put on the schedules at from 54 to 66 per cent., whilst wearing apparel was taxed from 80 to 92 per cent.," hats costing not over \$4.50 the dozen—the sort the plain people wear—are taxed at 77 per cent., and hats that cost \$18 the dozen—the sort the people who can take three months' vacations affect—are taxed at 47 per cent. Clothing, blankets, household goods, books, tools, machinery, wagons, buggies, nails, household furnishings, anything and everything that the people use in their daily lives and must have, are taxed. "The cost of all woolen goods has been kept up; but the tax on champagne has been reduced, on the principle, probably, that if a man can keep killed up on champagne he will not care how much his clothes and blankets and other things necessary to the comfort of his family cost." The minority say in their report that the annual burdens of Federal taxation have increased more than

\$376,000,000—a per capita now of more than \$1." This means that if everything in Virginia—all the lands, houses, automobiles, carriages, wagons, buggies, pianos, house furnishings, and every other sort of real and personal property in the State of Virginia should be sold at its assessed value last year, there would not be enough realized from the sale to pay the increased cost of Federal administration for two years.

As the minority say in their report, the "chief malefactors" are the tariff and the trusts, and the tariff and the trusts should be made the leading issues in the next Presidential campaign. In this sign, and in this sign only, can we conquer.

## EDUCATE THE PEOPLE AS TO THE AMENDMENTS.

The Fredericksburg Daily Star in commenting upon the proposed amendments to the Constitution of Virginia speaks the whole truth, in our opinion, when it says: "The people are to be called upon next November to vote for amendments to the new Constitution, the purport of which not one-fifth of them understand. It is a fair guess that not even this proportion of our voters could, if called upon, state the amendments which the General Assembly has submitted. . . . Discussion of these amendments may cause some interest to be taken by the voters as to their passage or non-passage."

In our very first utterance upon these changes in the organic law, we laid emphasis on the fact that there is no public demand for the passage of these amendments, and that the only persons who have taken any interest in the matter have been the legislators and county officials to whom the adoption of the amendments will mean material benefit. What our highly esteemed contemporary says, therefore, goes to bear out this contention, which we firmly believe to be correct.

Yet the die has been cast by the General Assembly and the Rubicon must be crossed at the polls by the people. It is, then, of the highest importance that the people should be fully aware of the significance of these changes and of the reasons advanced both for and against them. They should not vote blindly nor carelessly on such important propositions as changes in the fundamental law of the State.

Whatever may be their views upon the four propositions, whether they agree with us or not, we earnestly call upon our contemporaries in every county of the Commonwealth to come out and explain these amendments to the people. All over the State the press should diffuse a thorough understanding of the proposed amendments among the people.

There has been too little comment on these changes by the newspapers of the Old Dominion. Only three months remain before the vote on them will be taken, and now is the time to educate the people as to the purport and effect of these four proposed amendments. It is a public duty which the press owes to the people.

## PATTERSON OR THE PARTY?

Last week Governor Patterson made a proposition to the Democrats of Tennessee that he would call off the nomination which has been secured by him and go into another primary to decide who shall be the Democratic candidate for Governor. Nobody appears to have paid much attention to his offer, and the chances are that unless he shall definitely retire from the race, and without conditions, there will be another Democratic ticket in the field at the election in November.

Governor Patterson does not seem to realize fully what has happened to him. The recent election meant that the Democrats of Tennessee are through with him, have had more than enough of him, and will not have anything more to do with him. They do not trust him, and they will not vote for him, whatever party name he assume; that is to say, a very large majority of them have dropped him for good and all, and the reception of his proposition would appear to show that they will not even have diplomatic relations with him.

The Nashville American, which is standing by Patterson to the last ditch, calls upon the Democrats of Tennessee to think it over before finally rejecting the Governor's offer, which he is alleged to have made for the purpose of preserving "the party from defeat and the State from Republican domination." It reminds the Democrats, speaking of the Independent Democrats, that "every battle they ever fought was for self and not for country; every conflict was personal and not patriotic," and then it warns the whole posse comitatus, so to say, that the defeat of Patterson means one hundred and ninety-one Republican officeholders, giving the names of the offices in peril, and all sorts of other Republicanism in places of responsibility and trust. That is, indeed, a gloomy alternative, and just think of it! Governor Patterson could avert this host of calamities by himself withdrawing from the race for Governor, and definitely announcing that he will not be a candidate for the office. The American asks: "Is the destruction of Patterson of such vital importance that the party should be wrecked in an effort to be rid of him?" The American knows that some times desperate cases demand desperate remedies, but how would it do to put the question in this way, addressing it to Governor Patterson himself: Do you think that the Democratic party of Tennessee, which has twice honored you with the highest office in its gift, should be destroyed for the gratification of your personal ambition? Would you rather the Republicans should obtain control of the State with its immense patronage than to give up the office which you

hold? Would you rather wreck the party than be wrecked yourself? Is the whole State to be sacrificed for the gratification of the ambition of one man?

It is practically admitted by Patterson's own most loyal supporters that he will be defeated if he shall insist upon staying in the race. If he have any sense of loyalty to the State left, the natural thing for him to do is to step down and out now, as step down and out he must.

## THE BRAVEST ARE THE TENDEREST.

In the dispatches printed yesterday about the condition of Mayor Gaynor, almost hidden away there was this touching little part of the day's story: "After the conversation he sent Rufus (his son) to New York to purchase toys for two orphans who are invalid wardmates in St. Mary's Hospital with the wounded Mayor." That was all, but it was enough to reveal the more tender side of the uncompromising fighter of corruption and wrong. Auster in manner, severe in action, often caustic to certain of his fellowmen, there is yet a fine grain of kindness and sympathy in the man.

It has been so in the records of the great, grim men who have stood out as marked men in history. The chronicles of all ages show that of the nature of the real fighters, the aggressive reformers, strikingly true has been the couplet of Bayard Taylor:

"The bravest are the tenderest,  
 The loving are the daring."

## MR. BRYAN'S "PRESTIGE."

Mr. Bryan left the State with his prestige as a sound expositor of Democratic doctrine much impaired," says the Houston Post. But we thought you were the special mouthpiece of Mr. Bryan? Haven't you been reading out of the party for the last two years everybody who did not agree with you and Bryan and Cane Johnson? Besides, why should Mr. Bryan care for "prestige as a sound expositor of Democratic doctrine?" He can make more, and has made more, by strange expositions than by sticking to the law and the prophets. One "paramount" is as good as another or a little better while it lasts.

## THE SHIP SUBSIDY GANG.

During the last fiscal year, according to the Bureau of Navigation, 1,562 merchant ships were built in the United States of a gross tonnage of 347,925 as against 1,362 ships built the previous year of 222,816 gross tonnage. On the Great Lakes 47 steel steamers of 145,896 tons were placed in commission as against 26 of only 88,426 tons in the fiscal year, ended June 30, 1909. Fifteen new steel steamers were added to our ocean fleets, the largest being one of 6,974 tons; and the largest wooden vessel ever built in this country, a schooner of 3,730 tons, was floated.

The New York Financier does not think that this makes a very good showing for Protection, the policy which is supposed to promote all our industries. It may be that the ship-builders are holding back until they can pass the subsidy bill. It is sure to come up again at the next session of Congress and every time it comes up it ought to be killed some more. The ship subsidy gang know where the Treasury is and they will break in if honest people do not keep a wako.

## FIVE HAPPY MARRIAGES THIS WEEK

Ten couples were married in Houston, Texas, last week as compared with five couples in Richmond. "Getting married in Richmond," says the infamous Post, "is a tribulation; in Houston it continues to be a soulful festivity." It should be added, "at least until these twain can get to the Divorce Court."

Speaking of divorce, neither Virginia nor Texas has very much to boast of; but the advantages are clearly with Virginia. According to Census Bulletin 96, issued by the Department of Commerce and Labor, from 1867 to 1886, there were 2,635 divorces granted in Virginia. In the same period, there were 11,472 divorces granted in Texas. From 1887 to 1906, the number of divorces granted in Virginia were 12,129; in the same period, 62,055 divorces were granted in Texas. The ratio of divorces to population in Texas in 1900 was 131 per 100,000 population, and in Virginia, 38 per 100,000 population.

We cannot and do not blame the people of Texas very much—"almost any port is good in time of storm"; but we are sorry that there are any divorces in Virginia, and there would not be if we could only keep the incompatible away from this blessed region. Down in Texas where the man holds his wife only "something better than his dog, a little dearer than his horse," it is not to be wondered at that the Divorce Court should be regarded as a city of refuge for the poor women who have drawn blanks in the lottery of marriage.

Really, the only sane and safe State in the Union on the divorce question is South Carolina, where no divorces have been granted since the negro and Carpet-Bag Government was overthrown, and where divorce is forbidden by the white man's Constitution. The only Church which holds to the right view on the question of marriage is the Roman Catholic Church. In Texas, however, nobody could very much blame the Catholic Church for granting a special dispensation in the case

of many of those who are said to be married in that free and easy Commonwealth.

Speaker Cannon refuses to believe that he is dead. This is not saying, however, that he ought not to be. The pity of it is that he was ever born, and particularly in North Carolina.

Tim Woodruff appears to have been marked for slaughter. If he must die, it is hoped that he will insist upon being "laid out" in one of his fanciest week-ends.

George Harvey has one advantage of the Colonel—he can speak Esperanto, and the Colonel can only dabble in French, German, Italian, Dutch, Lombard, Gullah and several other languages and no end of dialects; but Dr. Harvey has him when it comes to the universal tongue.

We are quite willing to admit that the Rev. Dr. Eggleston preached gospel sermons while he was filling the Presbyterian pulpit in Greensboro, as charged by the Record of that town; but how did the Record know it? Who told it what sort of sermons they were? Would it know a "gospel sermon" if it heard it?

We learn from the Lawrenceville Times that Mr. S. H. Short has "just returned from a most pleasant trip to Boston. Mr. Short reports that he went through Harvard College while gone." Pretty fast college course, eh?

Writing about the Staunton "cave-in," Kja Hubbard Vance says in the Staunton Daily Leader, "Why is it that when something awful happens to a community that there are so many people who know it was going to happen and kept the secret to themselves?" It's always that way.

The Rural Retreat Times says: "What this country needs is more blackberry jam." How perfectly sweet that would be!

Almost every day we get requests for John D.'s address. He must get a pretty big Virginia mail. It is thus that we help Postmaster-General Hitchcock to reduce the deficit in his Department.

The Farmville correspondent of the Appomattox Times-Virginian thinks Farmville ought to have a commission form of government. He says:

"Town government by commission begins to excite interest among our people. We cannot afford to save money and yet get better results. Our Town Council is composed of business men, but it cannot reasonably be expected that they should work for the public without proper compensation. One good business manager could do the work of the town council while at work. This is no longer a village and the streets, sidewalks and utilities require constant and careful looking after."

Farmville will have it some day, too.

This is exactly what the Republican party in North Carolina has needed all along—more head.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer has been trying to find out what should be done with back yards. One of the best things to do with them is to keep them clean.

Probably some of our vigilant health officers will be able to explain why garbage is allowed to be taken through the streets in uncovered carts.

"If the Democracy of the nation hopes to win on the tariff issue it must follow the way pointed out by the Texas Democracy," says the Houston Post. Which one?

If the Hartford Courant will not take it amiss we would suggest that it might be well for it to let big national politics alone until after it has settled Senator Bulkeley's hash in Connecticut.

Did you see the rainbow about 7 o'clock Monday evening? It was set in the East and was one of the most beautiful of the many signs we see in the Heavens every day that Richmond is the centre of the universe. Everything is coming to Richmond now, days, even the rainbows.

There is really nothing new in the Wiley discovery about the right way to kill chickens. "Thirty years ago Wash McGee, of Belton, South Carolina, who kept one of the best eating houses on the old Greenville and Columbia Railroad, always killed his chickens by cutting their throats after tying them to the branches of trees. He did not know about striking the brain-pan of the chicken, as Dr. Wiley suggests is the proper thing to do; but he made the best fried chicken in a State which is second only to Virginia in knowing how to live on good things."

The Appomattox Times-Virginian says: "When we remember the cost of keeping a czar, employing an Emperor and feeding a King, we cannot join with those who charge our President with reckless use of people's money. Let him ride and sail at the cost of the nation, and yet he comes cheap."

But the Outlet has to pay for the Colonel's private car.

One of our contemporaries says: "Dispatches from Delaware, Ohio, state that the brickplace of Rutherford was destroyed by fire on Sunday. It was a two-story brick and was 100 years old. By the way, who was Rutherford B. Hayes, anyway?"

We pass it up. Was he born in North Carolina?

The Washington Post must have lost a dog, judging from the way it ridicules the campaign that has been started against the canine tribe. It insists now that "every rat, every mosquito, every man, and every human should have a muzzle. Diseases of all kinds must stop at once. Muzzle everybody and everything, and make a thorough job of it." Everything, contemporary, except the Independent press. But don't you think it would be better, really, to lock some of them up? There's Pinchot, for instance, and Garfield, why should they be suffered to go around at all?

# Daily Queries and Answers

Address all communications for this column to Query Editor, Times-Dispatch. No mathematical problems will be solved, no coins or stamps valued and no dealers' names will be given.

## Adam's First Wife.

Please inform me if there is any tradition about Adam having had more than one wife (Eve)? What about Lilith? Is she not reputed to have been the first wife? Any information bearing on this subject will greatly oblige me.

There is an old medieval tradition, derived from the Talmud, which holds, to the effect that our first parent was wedded to Lilith, an earth spirit, or witch, in the days before the creation of Eve. Lilith was still an inhabitant of the Garden of Eden. Lilith was a woman, except for the fact that she had no soul. The legend, strange as it is, admits of varied symbolic treatment. George MacDonald made it the subject of an allegorical novel and Rossetti used the name of Lilith in his poem "Lilith," a sort of spiritual vampire, in a sonnet beginning: "Of Adam's first wife, Lilith, it is told— How she loved before the gift of Eve. How, ere the snake's, her sweet tongue could deceive, And her enchanted hair was the first gold."

## Study of Law at Home.

I am a clerk and would like to study law without leaving my position. Would you kindly let me know through your paper, what course I should pursue and what books I should read. Thanking you for any answers you may give.

There is one obvious answer to a question such as yours—take a correspondence course. And yet, unless you have a certain amount of legal knowledge and determination to "win out," you had better think twice before deciding to enter upon what will be necessary to make your study a success. The law is a difficult subject. It requires a good general education as a foundation, an alert mind; and then the student must be able to grasp the meaning of legal terms, and in addition to this, the State bar examinations are difficult, covering a wide range of subjects, and presupposing a knowledge of the elements of a college education.

If you have graduated from a high school which fits for college you may do the law course with less probability of success otherwise not. The most sensible thing to do, in any case, is to get in touch with some lawyer of your neighborhood. Any successful man is glad to advise a beginner, and many men would be glad to lend their assistance in mapping out a line of reading or a course of

study. In touch with the proper man, you might even dispense with the correspondence course.

## Arrival of Ship in 1700.

Can you inform the writer how he can ascertain the name of a ship that arrived in Richmond from Liverpool, England, between 19th and 24th of December, 1799. It was the day selected for the "milk funeral" of General George Washington. FRANCIS.

We have made several inquiries, but regret that we cannot secure the data you desire.

## Policemen in New York.

Please tell me through your query and answers column how many policemen are in New York City.

10,946. SUBSCRIBER.

## Catholic Matters.

Please give me the following information through your Query Column: 1. How many Roman Catholics and how many Protestants are there in the United States? 2. Are there more Roman Catholics in the United States than any one of the Protestant sects? 3. Do you think the Catholics control the political situation by their votes in most sections of this country? 4. What are the primary objects of the "Jesuit Order"? 5. If a Roman Catholic would, could he become a Mason? 6. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 7. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 8. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 9. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 10. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 11. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 12. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 13. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 14. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 15. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 16. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 17. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 18. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 19. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 20. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 21. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 22. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 23. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 24. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 25. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 26. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 27. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 28. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 29. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 30. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 31. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 32. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 33. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 34. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 35. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 36. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 37. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 38. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 39. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 40. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 41. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 42. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 43. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 44. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 45. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 46. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 47. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 48. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 49. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 50. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 51. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 52. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 53. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 54. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 55. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 56. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 57. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 58. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 59. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 60. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 61. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 62. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 63. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 64. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 65. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 66. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 67. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 68. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 69. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 70. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 71. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 72. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 73. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 74. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 75. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 76. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 77. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 78. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 79. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 80. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 81. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 82. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 83. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 84. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 85. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 86. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 87. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 88. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 89. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 90. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 91. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 92. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 93. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 94. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 95. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 96. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 97. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 98. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 99. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 100. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 101. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 102. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 103. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 104. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 105. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 106. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 107. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 108. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 109. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 110. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 111. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 112. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 113. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 114. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 115. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 116. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 117. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 118. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 119. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 120. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 121. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 122. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 123. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 124. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 125. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 126. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 127. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 128. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 129. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 130. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 131. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 132. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 133. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 134. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 135. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 136. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 137. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 138. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 139. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 140. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 141. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 142. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 143. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 144. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 145. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 146. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 147. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 148. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 149. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 150. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 151. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 152. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 153. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 154. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 155. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 156. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 157. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 158. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 159. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 160. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 161. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 162. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 163. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 164. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 165. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 166. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 167. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 168. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 169. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 170. How many Catholics are there in the United States? 171. How many Catholics are there in the